

Bro. Carl Ketcherside takes a great deal of pride in the idea that he is “Restoring the Restoration.” He says the Restoration leaders of the early 19th century set out to unite the Christians of all sects, but that we today who claim to be a part of that movement deny that there are Christians in the sects. It is true that A. Campbell and others who labored with him believed there were many true Christians in the denominations of their day, and that they worked to gather them out of such relationships. It is also true that today there may be some of God’s children wearing denominational names and endorsing unscriptural practices by their presence and participation in them. But Bro. K’s work will not “restore the Restoration” for several reasons.

First, Campbell and his co-laborers called on Christians to come out of denominationalism and have no fellowship with the unscriptural doctrines and practices which were so prominent in them. Bro. K tells these Christians mld “concerned ones” to stay where they are and work for the unity of all believers. In *Mission Messenger*, June 1962, pp. 7-10, he says, “We are striving for a fellowship of the concerned ones in every party instead of having concern for another party.... To take the concerned ones out of all the parties and create a new party composed of these would be a tragic error. It would do the very thing we opposed.... Any person who must leave where he is and join something else to be in the church is not in Christ to start with Let the brethren remain where they are, share the truths they learn and learn additional truths. It is not necessary to change parties to practice truth.”

In these lines Bro. K. says, “to take the concerned ones out of all the parties and create a new party composed of these would be a tragic error.” But there [sic] is exactly what Campbell and his co-laborers did. Was their work a “tragic error”? If Bro. K thinks so, why does he say he is trying to do the same thing Campbell and others did? Would there have been a Restoration Movement if Campbell and his co-laborers had advocated that brethren stay where they are, share the truths they learn and learn additional truths”? Would churches of Christ have sprung up all over the land if Campbell and his co-laborers had said, “It is not necessary to change parties to practice truth”?

Next, Bro. K quotes many of the Restoration writers to show that he holds the same view they held with reference to God’s children being a scattered flock in the “sectarian hills.” Moses E. Lard is quoted as holding the same views. For a full statement of these matters read *Mission Messenger*, February 1957, p. 12, and January 1960, p. 6. In these places Lard is quoted as saying, “Against the individual members of these parties we cannot have even one unkind feeling. Many of them we regard as true Christians, and love them sincerely. But as long as they occupy a place in bodies holding traditional and unsanctioned tenets; holding practices unknown to the Bible, and supporting humanly imposed names, we must tell them plainly that they stand on apostate ground.” This is from Lard’s *Quarterly*, March, 1864.

Does Bro. K tell people in denominational parties that they stand on “apostate ground,” or does he tell them to stay where they are and work as concerned ones for unity? The fact that these people stood on “apostate ground” is the reason why Campbell, Lard, and others of their day called on them to “come out from among” those who believed and practiced error and form a body of people free from such error.

But if Bro. K had a [sic] read a little more in Lard’s *Quarterly*, he would have found language so unlike his that he would no more claim him than he is willing to claim some of us today who criticize his teaching. Lard said, “We have declared a thousand times and more that whatever it (New Testament) does not teach we must not hold, and whatever it does not sanction we must not practice. He who ignores or repudiates those principles, whether he be preacher, or layman, has by the act become an apostate from

our ranks; and the sooner he lifts his hand high, avows the fact, and goes out from amongst us the better, yes, verily, the better for us.” Does this sound like Moses E. Lard would sanction brethren staying in denominational bodies to work for the unity of all believers in the Sonship of Christ? Or may we view his as “turning over in his grave” at the mention of it?

With reference to brethren introducing instruments of music into worship, Lard said, “In what light then must we view him who attempts to introduce it into churches of Christ of the present day? I answer, as an insulter of the authority of Christ, and as a defiant and impious innovator of the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship.” And he advised the following action as a remedy for trouble over the introduction of instruments into worship: “1. Let every preacher in our ranks resolve at once that he will never, under any circumstances or on any account, enter a meeting house belonging to our brethren in which an organ stands.... 2. Let no brother who takes a letter from one church ever unite with another using an organ. Rather let him live out of a church than go into such a den. 3. Let those brethren who oppose the introduction of an organ first remonstrate in gentle, kind, but decided terms. If their remonstrance is unheeded, and the organ is brought in, then let them at once, and without even the formality of asking for a letter, abandon the church so acting; and let all such members unite elsewhere. Thus these organ-grinding churches will in the lapse of time be broken down, or wholly apostatize, and the sooner they are in fragments the better for the cause of Christ. I have no sympathy with them, no fellowship for them, and so help me God never intend knowingly to put my foot into one of them. As a people we claim to be engaged in an effort to return to the purity, simplicity, freedom from ostentation and pride, of the ancient apostolic churches. Let us, then, neither wink at anything standing in the way, nor compromise aught essential to this end. ‘!’he moment we do so our unity is at an end, and our hopes are in the dust” (Lard’s Quarterly, 1864, Vol 1, p. 330 ff.).

Bro. K makes no pretense of following Lard at this point. In fact his actions are completely opposite. He teaches that the use of instruments in worship must not be made a test of fellowship. Where Lard advised brethren to walk out and never set foot in the house of worship where instruments are used, Bro. K says for brethren to stay and work for unity. Where Lard advised preachers never to preach where instruments are used, Bro. K tells them to go right along and enjoy fellowship in the things on which they are agreed. He says he does not sing when instruments are played in worship because his conscience will not permit it. I assume his conscience is based on New Testament teaching. If he should sing when the instrument is played, he would sin. Why? Because he violated his conscience? or because he would be violating scripture teaching? If the latter, it follows that all who sing with instruments sin when they do so. If the former, it follows that the use of instruments in worship is right and proper to one who is properly taught. From this conclusion there is no escape. Let Bro. K tell us why he does not sing when instruments are played and we will see whether he thinks their introduction into worship was a sin. If their introduction was a sin, is not their continued use a sin? Can we afford to encourage people in sin?